

REMARKS

Applicant acknowledges the withdrawal of claims 13-18 from further consideration pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.142(b) based upon the restriction requirements.

The rejection of claims 8-9 under the 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bartholomew 948 is respectfully traversed.

Applicant has amended claim 8 as well as claim 1 to clarify the subject invention and to overcome any apparent misunderstanding of the function of the annular band in the claimed arrangement of the connecting structure of the subject invention. As now clearly set forth in claim 8 the annular rubber band has two ends with one end located adjacent the open end of the resin tube and the opposite end extending a predetermined distance beyond the longitudinal end of the quick connector after it is press fitted into the open end of the resin tube. Not only is the arrangement of the annular band different in the subject invention but more importantly it has an entirely different function from the function of the collar in Bartholomew. As explained in column 7 of Bartholomew, lines 37-45, the collar 54 serves the purpose of distributing the forces applied by the sleeve 22, i.e., the clamp, which surrounds the entire band and extends beyond both ends of the band. In the subject invention the clamp is optional, and even if it were included, it would not surround the band or have a length as long as the annular band. The rubber band taught in the subject application prevents disengagement of the quick connector and resin tube. To accomplish this, it is critical to the subject invention that the annular band extend over the longitudinal end of the quick connector. In Bartholomew the collar 54 does not even come close to the end portion 28 of the quick connector much less extend beyond it nor does the collar 54 serve the same purpose as the annular band of the subject invention. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) should be withdrawn.


The rejection of claims 1-5 and 10-12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bartholomew '948 in view of Silvey is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner has apparently misunderstood the function of the annular band in the present invention which serves an entirely different function from the

function of the collar 54 in Bartholomew. The explanation provided above relative to the rejection of claim 8 under 35 USC 102 applies equally as well to this rejection of claims 1-5 and 10-12 under 35 USC 103. Accordingly, the examiner's comments with regard to the collar, i.e., annular band 54 of Bartholomew are incorrect and completely inconsistent with the teaching in Bartholomew in column 7, lines 37-45. The Examiner has simply applied the language of applicant's claims to Bartholomew which does not apply, as explained above. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 1-5 and 10-12 as amended based upon the teaching of Bartholomew '948 should be withdrawn. Silvey does not teach the use of an annular band as claimed. Accordingly, claims 1, 2, 4-5 and 10-11 are clearly patentable over Bartholomew taken alone or in combination with Silvey.

Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-2 and 4-11 is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,




Eugene Lieberstein
Reg. No. 24,645

ANDERSON, KILL & OLICK
1251 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10020-1182
(212) 278-1000

MAILING CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria VA 22313-1450 on April 5th, 2006.



Date: April 5th, 2006